



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/766,723	01/22/2001	Jeffrey B. Hoke	3912E (DIV)	2047

7590 09/06/2006

Chief Patent Counsel
Engelhard Corporation
101 Wood Avenue
P.O. Box 770
Iselin, NJ 08830-0770

EXAMINER

JASTRZAB, KRISANNE MARIE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1744

DATE MAILED: 09/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/766,723

Applicant(s)

HOKE ET AL.

Examiner

Krisanne Jastrzab

Art Unit

1744

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 49-60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 49-60 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 49-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fromson et al., U.S. patent No. 5,711,071 in view of Hager DE 4007964A1 (abs).

Art Unit: 1744

Fromson et al., teach the application of a catalytic coating to the surfaces of an air conditioning and ventilating system for a vehicle wherein the catalyst is applied to radiators and condensers, heat exchange surfaces, fan blades, grill means and other ventilating components in order to treat the air surrounding the vehicle to eliminate ozone therein and minimize any further contribution to the pollution of the surrounding atmosphere. See the abstract, column 1, and column 4, line 8 through column 5, line 50.

Hager teaches the provision of a catalytic coating on outdoor surfaces such as those of buildings to remove ozone from the surrounding atmosphere to prevent smog formation. CuO is recited as the preferred catalyst. See the English abstract.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to form a catalyst coating on the outdoor components of a building HVAC system, such as the condenser, as applied to the equivalent vehicular components as taught in Fromson et al., because it would act to remove ozone from the surrounding atmosphere and reduce smog formation by placement on building structures as taught in Hager.

With respect to claim 58, it is well recognized that the heat exchange surfaces in HVAC systems will reach temperatures above 25° C during normal operation.

Claim 60 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fromson et al., and Hager as applied to claims 49-59 above, and further in view of Applicant's admission of the state of the art.

Art Unit: 1744

On page 2, lines 35-38 of Applicant's instant specification Applicant acknowledges the catalytic activity of CuO, and on page 3, lines 10-16 Applicant also acknowledges the art recognition of the catalytic activity of manganese oxide.

Hager clearly teaches the use of copper oxides and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ any recognized equivalent thereof, such as manganese oxide, which equivalence is acknowledged by Applicant's own admission of the state of the prior art.

Claims 49-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beitz et al., EP 634205A (abs).

Beitz et al., teach incorporating an ozone decomposing catalyst onto the equipment in air conditioning and ventilating equipment. It is active at normal ambient temperatures to decompose ozone in an air stream. Beitz et al., do not specifically recite that the catalyst is incorporated onto an outdoor component of the air conditioning or ventilation system, however, they clearly specify that it is functional at ambient or normal atmospheric temperatures, and it is commonly recognized that our atmosphere contains a measurable degree of ozone. As such, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the catalyst of Beitz et al., on an outdoor component of an air conditioning or ventilating system, such as a condenser, because it would effectively combat the influx of ozone into an air conditioned residence.

With respect to claim 58, it is well recognized that the heat exchange surfaces in HVAC systems will reach temperatures above 25° C during normal operation.

Double Patenting

Claims 49-60 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2 and 22-25 of U.S. Patent No. 5,620,672. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are of the same inventive concept with '672 reciting a specific ozone treating catalyst for the apparatus claimed in the instant claims, the ozone decomposing capability of the recited catalyst being well recognized in the art and therefor obvious in it's application. '672 further claims application of the catalyst to components such a fan blades, which are well recognized as part of an outdoor component of an air handling system.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 6/16/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the modification of the Beitz reference to place the catalyst on an outdoor component of the ventilating system would destroy the reference, however, the Examiner would disagree. Beitz clearly teaches using the catalyst on air conditioning and ventilating components and does not exclude placement of the catalyst on the outdoor components thereof.

Applicant further argues that the catalyst of Beitz is used at ambient temperatures and below, but that the catalyst of the instant invention is used at high temperatures and bulk air flow. The Examiner would note that Beitz teaches that the

Art Unit: 1744

catalyst can function at ambient temperatures and does not require high temperatures, however, the reference does not teach that the catalyst will not function at high temperatures.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 49-52 rejected of Fromson et al., have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krisanne Jastrzab whose telephone number is 571-272-1279. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. 6:00am-4:30pm.

Art Unit: 1744

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gladys Corcoran can be reached on 571-272-1214. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Krisanne Jastrzab
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1744

August 31, 2006